FALL BROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROJECT – Leominster, MA

FALL BROOK BUILDING COMMITTEE (FBBC) MEETING #44

Tuesday, June 9, 2026 In-Person 1:00pm

Office of Emergency Management
37 Carter Street, Leominster, MA

Mark Bodanza	Greg Chapdelaine	Sandra Cucchiara	Robin Desmond
Arthur Elbthal	Jacob Fleming	Suzanne Koehler	Steven Mammone
Dean Mazzarella, Chair	Melanie Mikels	Elliot "Butch" Nadeau	Jennifer Reddington
	Brandon Robbins	Jeffrey Sullivan	

In memoriam Peter Angelini (1956-2025)

Meeting Minutes

A publicly posted meeting of the Fall Brook Building Committee (FBBC) was held at the above listed date, time, and location. Committee members and participants were:

Voting Members (Quorum = 8)	Present	Notes
Mr. Mark Bodanza		City Councilor
Mr. Greg Chapdelaine	X	City Purchasing Agent
Ms. Sandra Cucchiara	X	School Committee Member
Ms. Robin Desmond	Remote	Superintendent of Schools
Mr. Arthur Elbthal	X	Leominster Emergency Management, Director
Mr. Jacob Fleming		Leominster DPW Business Manager
Ms. Suzanne Koehler	Remote	Former School Committee Member
Mr. Steven Mammone	Remote	Asst. Superintendent of Schools
Mayor Dean Mazzarella, Chair		Mayor and School Committee member
Ms. Melanie Mikels	Remote	School Business Manager
Mr. Elliot Nadeau		School Facilities Director
Ms. Jennifer Reddington	X	City Comptroller
Mr. Brandon Robbins		City Councilor
Mr. Jeffrey Sullivan	Remote	Fall Brook Elementary School Principal
Other Participants		
Meredith Tarr		City of Leominster

John Roseberry		Leominster DPW Senior Engineer
Christine Silverman		Leominster Public Schools
Lynn Fiandaca		Leominster Public Schools
Richard Bergeron		Leominster Public Schools
Will Sullivan		Leominster Public Schools
Craig DiCarlo	X	LeftField, Project Director
Jay Faxon		LeftField, MEP Expert
Linda Liporto	Remote	LeftField, Senior Project Manager
Bill Shaw	X	LeftField, Site Representative
Jim Rogers		LeftField, President
Adele Sands		LeftField, Education Liaison
Nereyda Rodriguez	Remote	Miller Dyer Spears, Principal in Charge
Danyul Cho	X	Miller Dyer Spears, Project Manager
Amy MacKrell		Miller Dyer Spears, Principal
Erica Patten	Remote	Miller Dyer Spears, Project Architect
Lena Owens		Studio 2112
Lynne Giesecke		Studio 2112
Dana Geva		Studio 2112
Frank Holmes		Langan
Maggie Laracy		Langan
Keith Lane		GGD Consulting Engineers
David Pereira		GGD Consulting Engineers
Louis Vieira		GGD Consulting Engineers
Matthew Woodward		GGD Consulting Engineers

1 – Call to Order

Ms. Desmond called the meeting to order at 1:06pm. Roll call was conducted, and a quorum was present.

2 – Administrative Actions

LeftField introduced their site representative, Bill Shaw, who will be the OPM Site Representative. He has extensive experience in architecture and construction, including over 15 years of experience on public school construction projects and will be on site daily once construction begins.

2a – Previous Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held on May 19, 2026, was made by Mr. Chapdelaine and seconded by Ms. Reddington.

There was no discussion. A show of hands vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously.

2b – Invoice Log and Warrant Approval

LeftField presented the invoice log for the May invoices which included OPM services, cost estimating services, structural peer review of the 60% CD package, designer services, and electronic bidding services, for a total of $609,998.27.

A motion to approve Warrant number W52FY26 in the amount of $609,998.27 was made by Ms. Reddington and seconded by Mr. Chapdelaine.

There was no discussion. A show of hands vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously.

2c – Budget Update

LeftField presented the Total Project Budget through May 2026. The project has committed 14% and expended 7% of the $114.8 million budget. Expenditure continues to be in line with the progress of the project.

2d – Schedule Update

LeftField presented the project schedule. Bidding for the Early Site Package (ESP) was ongoing, and bids were due June 11, 2026. The estimated construction cost of the ESP is approximately $1.4 million. The work will be performed in Summer 2026, and will begin after the last day of classes.

The project was preparing for pre-qualification of filed sub-bidders and general contractors for the main construction package will be bid in late summer / early fall and awarded in October.

2e – Public Outreach Campaign

LeftField provided an update to the building committee on the progress of the public outreach campaign. On June 1, 2026, LeftField and MDS presented the project to the School Committee, which was the last public meeting of this campaign. Passive outreach strategies will continue through Fall 2026, including sandwich boards for the drop-off and pick-up line, featuring QR codes to the project website. LeftField will continue providing content for social media posts in the city.

.LeftField presented the additional documents and information that the FBBC previously request to be added to the project website. The building committee requested the following information be added to the project website:

1. Gantt chart schedule to project website.
2. An instructional note to point to the documents.
3. A “coming soon" construction page with description of what will be posted there – including progress photos and contractor’s look-ahead schedule
4. Monthly OPM reports to the Documents tab

5. MSBA Total Project Budget and percentages of the budget that are committed and expended

2f – Contract for Materials Testing Services

LeftField presented the results of the solicitation for materials testing and inspection services. Six proposals were received from the following companies:

- Fenagh Engineering & Testing, Inc.
- John Turner Consulting
- Prime Consulting
- Thompson & Lichtner
- UTS of Massachusetts, Inc.
- Yankee Testing & Engineering

After reviewing the proposals, the selection committee identified Yankee Testing & Engineering as the most advantageous based on qualifications, experience, price, and other factors.

A motion to authorize the City to contract with Yankee Testing & Engineering for Independent Materials Testing and Inspection services based on unit costs and a not-to-exceed fee of $250,000 for a period of three-and-one-half (3-1/2) years was made by Mr. Chapdelaine and was seconded by Ms. Cucchiara.

There was no discussion. A roll call vote was taken.

Voting Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Not Present
Mr. Mark Bodanza				X
Mr. Greg Chapdelaine	X			
Ms. Sandra Cucchiara	X			
Ms. Robin Desmond	X			
Mr. Arthur Elbthal	X			
Mr. Jacob Fleming				X
Ms. Suzanne Koehler	X			
Mr. Steven Mammone	X			
Mayor Dean Mazzarella, Chair				X
Ms. Melanie Mikels	X			
Mr. Elliot Nadeau				X
Ms. Jennifer Reddington	X			
Mr. Brandon Robbins				X
Mr. Jeffrey Sullivan	X			

The motion carried 9-0-0.

2g – Designer Contract Amendment #13

LeftField presented Additional Service Request (ASR) #13 to provide landscape design services for the temporary playground and restoration of the northern baseball and soccer field, which was not within the original scope of the project. The added scope is a necessary aspect of the site logistics and phasing strategy previously prepared by the project management consultant, Turner Construction, and approved by the FBBC.

A motion to approve *Additional Services Request #13* for design services related to the temporary playground and restoration of the existing playing fields to the north of the site for a fee of $16,950 and to add it to *Designer Contract Amendment 13*, was made by Ms. Reddington and was seconded by Mr. Chapdelaine.

There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken.

Voting Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Not Present
Mr. Mark Bodanza				X
Mr. Greg Chapdelaine	X			
Ms. Sandra Cucchiara	X			
Ms. Robin Desmond	X			
Mr. Arthur Elbthal	X			
Mr. Jacob Fleming				X
Ms. Suzanne Koehler	X			
Mr. Steven Mammone	X			
Mayor Dean Mazzarella, Chair				X
Ms. Melanie Mikels	X			
Mr. Elliot Nadeau				X
Ms. Jennifer Reddington	X			
Mr. Brandon Robbins				X
Mr. Jeffrey Sullivan	X			

The motion carried 9-0-0.

3 – Designer Report

3a – Monumental Sign Options

MDS continue the discussion from the May FBBC meeting regarding the monumental sign for the new school. MDS presented four design images of static sign options. The static sign is intended to be installed in front of the new building drive. MDS also continued the discussion of a digital sign near

Union Street, similar to signs that have been installed at other schools in Leominster. LeftField reported on two questions previously posed to the MSBA. First, to the question of whether a monumental sign is required, the MSBA responded that a monumental sign is not required, though it is common on MSBA school projects. Second, to the question of whether procuring the sign outside of the general contractor's scope would make it ineligible for reimbursement, the MSBA responded they did not know and were not able to provide an answer prior to this FBBC meeting.

The three main options before the FBBC were, 1) a static sign at Fall Brook for $39,000, 2) a monumental sign including a digital component at Fall Brook for $60,800, and 3) a static sign at Fall Brook and a separate digital sign near Union Street $71,700.

A discussion was held. The committee decided to exclude a digital sign at Union Street from the scope of the project for now but possibly adding it towards the end of the project or procuring it outside of the project. The committee decided to include a static sign near the new school, in the style of the option shown on the upper right of the design slide, featuring a brick base, rectangular metal blade, metal letters of the school name, and no mascot.

A motion to exclude a digital sign at Union Street from the scope of the project at this time and to include a static sign near the new school as presented on the upper right of the design slide, featuring a brick base, rectangular metal blade, metal letters of the school name, and no mascot, was made by Mr. Chapdelaine and seconded by Ms. Reddington.

There was no further discussion. A show of hands vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chapdelaine asked for clarification on whether a static monumental sign is included in the cost estimate. MDS responded that one is included in the cost estimate.

3d – Bid Alternate

Based on the previous discussion, the koi pond is the only remaining bid alternate. Several committee members inquired about the purpose of a koi pond. During the early design phases, the MSBA required multiple visioning sessions, during which the designer received feedback that the existing koi pond is an important element of the school. Mr. Sullivan advised that the educational plan includes a koi pond in the new school as a tool to help students with emotional regulation and is viewed by students, parents, and staff as a meaningful feature at Fall Brook. Ms. Cucchiara and Ms. Koehler expressed concern with using public money for a built-in feature in a public school versus a much smaller fish tank. In response to a question about MSBA reimbursement, LeftField advised the koi pond is in the project funding agreement and is eligible for reimbursement. Ms. Reddington added that square-foot cost of the building is above the MSBA's cap for reimbursement both with and without the koi pond being included. Mr. Sullivan advised that the school department would continue to be responsible for maintenance costs. Mr. Mammone and Ms. Mikels advised that the koi pond is an important feature for staff, families, and students, and requested it be included as a bid alternate. LeftField inquired whether MDS could

remove the bid alternate at the next FBBC meeting. MDS responded that removal of the koi pond bid alternate from the documents would be very difficult at this time or after the July FBBC meeting. Additional discussion was held.

A motion was made to keep the koi pond as a bid alternate was made by Mr. Mammone. Mr. Mammone withdrew the motion. No vote was taken.

The building committee's preference was to leave the koi pond as a bid alternate.

4 – Items not Anticipated 48 Hours in Advance of the Meeting

4a – Existing Field Use Diagram

LeftField presented an updated diagram of playing field use during construction; the southern soccer field in the location of the new school building will no longer accessible beginning this summer; the northern soccer and baseball field will be inaccessible by the school and public as early as October or November 2026 but will be made available again spring/summer of 2030; to make way for the construction vehicle access road, the existing play ground will be replaced by a temporary playground as early as November 2026.

4b – Camera During Construction

LeftField presented a list of camera types and purposes, which are common at school construction projects, and requested feedback from the FBBC.

1. Security cameras
    a. Video feed to Police and Fire Departments
    b. Crime Deterrence
    c. Video record of activities on site which can be used for investigations
2. Building Mounted Cameras
    a. Provide construction progress images
    b. Time-lapse Photography
    c. Livestream Video for community engagement
3. Drone Images & Video
    a. Aerial record of construction progress
    b. Posted to the website for public engagement

A discussion was held. The FBBC directed the project team to not include explicit requirements for the general contractor to use security cameras, building mounted cameras, or drone cameras during construction, rather to reinforce the contract requirement that the general contractor is fully responsible for security of the construction site and leave the means and methods to the general contractor.

It was noted that the Leominster Police Department has drones and may choose to fly them and

generate aerial photographs at their discretion. LeftField's site representative will generate construction progress photos from ground level for use on the project website.

4c – Design Images

MDS presented a series of exterior and interior design images of the new school.

The parking lot and drive aisles were reviewed with the Police Department and Fire Department for security and emergency access to the school. Mr. Elbthal inquired about the fire access road behind the school and its vehicle load capacity for a Fire Department engine, ladder truck, and tanker truck. MDS responded that the hardscape next to the building is designed for Fire Department emergency access whereas the access road near the existing power lines is for utility company access. MDS will research and report on the vehicle loading capacity of the hardscape intended for Fire Department access to the generator, electrical transformers, and rear of the school.

The exterior materials were the same as previously presented and approved by the FBBC.

The interior design remains consistent with prior presentations and FBBC approvals. In coordination with the school department, the building will include solid material for the guardrails at the ramps and stairs to reduce distractions and promote student safety.

A final Working Group meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2026.

5 – Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6 – Next Steps

LeftField presented the meetings and activities planned for the next three months.

7 – Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Chapdelaine and seconded by Ms. Cucchiara. There was no discussion. A show of hands vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.

Documents and Exhibits

- Fall Brook Building Committee Meeting #44 slideshow presentation by LeftField, dated 6/9/26.

Attachments

- None